

REMARKSDisclosure

The disclosure has been amended to correct the errors noted with respect to the identification of Figures 12 to 14. The Examiner's close review of the application is appreciated.

Claims

Claims 1 to 10 remain in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1 to 10 in view of the following remarks.

Claims 3 and 6 have been amended to correct the spelling and terminology errors noted therein by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsung-Ping (U.S. Patent no. 6,119,811). Since a rejection under 102 for anticipation requires that the single reference teach each and every element of the rejected claim (*Atlas Powder v. E.I. DuPont*, 750 F.2d 1569 (224 USPQ 409)(Fed. Cir. 1984)), applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 102 in this case fail to meet this test.

Applicant's invention of claim 1 is a collapsible loading ramp comprising: at least a pair of longitudinal support structures, each having an upper surface and including a raised post extending from the upper surface; a cross-member formed to attach between the at least a pair of longitudinal support structures by removably engaging against the posts; and the at least a pair of longitudinal support structures and the cross member each being separable from the others for disassembly and collapsing of the ramp. Tsung-Ping does not teach such a loading ramp.

First, Tsung-Ping does not show a cross member formed to attach between a pair of longitudinal support structures by removably engaging against a post extending from the upper surface of each longitudinal support structure. While the Examiner argues that such posts are shown by shaft (30) or rod (33) and the cross member is shown by steps (15), applicant cannot agree that these structures operate as presently claimed. With respect to shaft (30), it appears to simply act as a pivot pin for a hinge connecting supporting rod (10) to step (15). As such step (15) is permanently engaged to shaft (30), rather than removeably engaged as presently claimed. If rod (33) is considered, it is noted that rod (33) is permanent affixed to and moves with step (15) and, therefore, step (15) is not and cannot be removeably engaged against rod (33).

Second, Tsung-Ping does not teach that the longitudinal support structures and the cross member are each separable from the others for collapsing the ramp. The Examiner has pointed to Figures 2, 6 and 7 as showing this aspect of the invention. However, upon close study of Tsung-Ping, the parts (10) and (15) remain secured together by shafts (30) when the structure is collapsed. After constuction, as is shown in Figure 2, the parts in Tsung-Ping are clearly not separable from each other for collapsing the ramp, as is presently claimed.

Since Tsung-Ping does not teach all of the elements of claim 1, this claim and dependent claims 2 to 10 are clearly not anticipated by this prior reference. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner has further rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Tsung-Ping (U.S. Patent no. 6,119,811). Since Tsung-Ping does not teach or suggest various elements of claim 1, this rejection of claim 6, which depends from claim 1, should also be withdrawn.

Conclusions

In light of the arguments presented by applicant herein, applicant submits that claims 1 to 10 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner

withdraw all rejections with regard to the claims in reliance on one or more of the grounds submitted by the applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Roseann B. Caldwell for".

Roseann B. Caldwell,
Reg. No. 37,077

BENNETT JONES LLP
4500 - 855 - 2nd Street S.W.
Calgary, Alberta CANADA
T2P 4K7

tel. (403) 298-3661
fax (403) 265-7219

Date: June 23, 2004